

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 stand rejected although claim 9 is only objected to. Claims 3, 4, 5, 8, and 12-14 are cancelled. Claims 1, 2, 6, and 9-11 are amended. Objected-to claim 9 is rewritten in independent form. No new subject matter is added. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, and 9-11 are now pending in the application. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Objection to Specification

The specification has been amended to include a new title, as required by the Office Action.

Objection to Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as failing to show every feature recited in the claims.

The Office Action has not identified which elements of the claims are missing from the drawings. The applicant has reviewed all of the pending claims and verified that all of the recited elements are shown in the drawings as filed.

In the Claims

The amendments to claims 1 and 10 are fully supported in the application as filed at, e.g., paragraph [0057] and original claim 9.

The amendments to claims 2 and 11 are fully supported in the application as filed at, e.g., original claims 8 and 14.

No grounds for rejection of claim 9 are provided in the Office Action and none appear to be appropriate. Consequently, claim 9 is rewritten in independent form. As described below for claims 1 and 10, none of the references teach the judging means and sudden cause recited in claim 9. Consequently, amended claim 9 is allowable over the cited references.

Claim Objections

Claims 9 and 14 stand objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form.

Claim 9 has been rewritten in independent form. Claim 14 is cancelled.

Claim Rejections

Claims 6, 7, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 3, 4, 11, 8 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Claims 3, 4, 8, and 14 have been cancelled. Claims 6 and 7 are now definite following the amendment to claim 1 described below. Claim 11 has been amended to remove the material that was rejected (predetermined time).

Claims 1-4, 10, 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yamamoto.

Claims 5, 6, 7 and 13 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the art as applied to claims 1 and 13 and further in view of Hanamoto et al.

Claims 1 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by either Tseng et al. or Chu.

Claims 2, 3, 4, 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the art as applied to claims 1 and 10 (Tseng et al. or Chu) and further in view of Liang et al.

Claims 5, 6 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the art as applied to claims 1 and 10 and further in view of Hanamoto et al.

The applicant traverses the rejections.

Claims 1 and 10 have been amended to include judging of the cause of the interruption and a sudden cause based on an application start in the host. As stated in the Office Action, Yamamoto, Tseng, Chu, and Liang do not teach a judging means or a sudden cause for a recording interruption. Hanamoto teaches that a jarring of the apparatus or “an externally imparted force” can cause a recording interruption. See Hanamoto column 7, lines 11-15. The physical force described in Hanamoto is not equivalent to the sudden cause based on an application start recited in the amended claims. Since the references do not teach all of the

elements recited in the claims, claim 1 and 10 are allowable over Yamamoto, Tseng, Chu, and Liang. Further, since neither these references nor Hanamoto teaches all of the features recited in the claims, claims 1 and 10 are allowable over the combination of Hanamoto and any of the other references.

Claims 2, 6, 7, and 11 depend from claims 1 and 10. These claims are likewise allowable over the references for at least the reasons stated above for claims 1 and 10.

Claims 3, 4, 5, 8, 12, 13, and 14 are cancelled.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Office Action indicated that the identification of published US application Tseng US2003/165097 listed in PTO Form 1449 previously submitted was incorrectly cited. However, this Tseng publication subsequently issued as US 6,922,382 which the Examiner cited on Form PTO-892.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicant believes the application should be in condition for allowance. If any questions remain, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned.

Customer No.

20575

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



By

Alexander C. Johnson, Jr.
Registration No. 29,396

210 S.W. Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 222-3613